REMARKS

1.   Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, the applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15, and added new claims 18 - 23. The remaining claims remain in the application, without amendment, as originally presented.

2.   Claims 7, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook, et al. (Cook, U.S. Patent No. 6,005,884). Claims 1, 3-6, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al., in view of Heiman et al. (Heiman, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,918). Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook, et al., in view of Heiman, or Cook et al as applied to claims 1 and 7 above respectively and further in view of Ames (Ames, U.S. Patent No. 5,233,626. Claim 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al., as applied to claim 7 and 12 above, and further in view of Heiman et al. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook, et al., in view of Heiman et al as applied to claim 15 above and further in view of Brozovich et al (Brozovich, US Patent No. 5,661,434.

3.   Each of the examiner's rejections is primarily based on Cook (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,884). The applicant amends independent claims 1, 7, and 15 to overcome Cook. The applicant also amends dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13 to provide proper antecedent basis, according to the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 7.

        The applicant amends independent claims 1, 7, and 15 to include the limitation "telephone" in the preamble of the claims to describe "wireless cellular telephone communication" and in the body of the claims to describe "telephone signal(s)." Support for this amendment may be found in the present specification, for example, on page 3, line 28, and page 9, line 15 ("telephone").

        Hence, claims 1, 7, and 15 are now limited to "wireless cellular telephone communication," rather than "wireless cellular communication," as recited in the previous version of claims 1, 7, and 15. Further, the claims 1, 7, and 15 are now limited to "telephone signal(s)" rather than "signal(s)," as recited in the previous version of claims 1, 7, and 15.

        Cook expressly teaches away from wireless cellular radiotelephone communication:

9

Docket No. 010077   PATENT

generally in col. 35, lines 28-33, and specifically in col. 35, lines 34-56. Claims 1, 7, and 15 are amended to include the general term "telephone," and may or may not be interpreted to include the specific limitations of cellular radiotelephone systems specifically recited by Cook.

4.   The applicant adds new dependent claims 18, 20, and 22 to include the limitation: "at least one of the slave-CPUs being adapted to vary a size of a coverage area provided by an associated slave transceiver." The applicant further added new dependent claims 19, 21, and 23, which are dependent on dependent claims 18, 20, and 22, respectively, to further define the added limitation to dependent claims 18, 20, and 22. Support for new dependent claims 18, 20, and 22 and for new dependent claims 19, 21, and 23 may be found in the present specification, for example, on page 5, lines 14-21, and on page 17, line 25 to page 18, line 6. Cook does not teach or suggest the limitation added in claims 18, 20, and 22.

        Cook teaches at col. 22, lines 7-22:

        "The level detector unit 101 functions as an automatic level controller for the repeater 18 by controlling the attenuation level of the variable attenuator 88. The variable attenuator 88 can be used to attenuate the RF level of transmitted outgoing data, as required, to avoid driving the power amplifier 104 into a compression state. Likewise, the variable attenuator 88 can control the RF level of amplified incoming data to prevent driving the receiver 31 of the base station 12 into a saturation state. Based on the state of the control signal output by the comparator 98, the level detector unit 101 can determine whether the data communications system 10 is operating in the transmit or the receive state. In response to the control signal, as well as the detected power level of the signal coupled by the coupler 110, the level detector unit 101 sets the attenuation level of the variable attenuator 88." (emphasis added) However, Cook's teaching to "avoid driving the power amplifier 104 into a compression state" in the transmit path, and "prevent driving the receiver 31 of the base station 12 into a saturation state" in the receive path is not the same as the claimed limitation: "at least one of the slave-CPUs being adapted to vary a size of a coverage area provided by an associated slave transceiver."

        Cook also teaches Figs. 1-4 two coverage areas (20) for two repeaters (18), in Figs. 8A-D increasing the total coverage area by adding more repeaters (18), in Fig. 9 duplicate coverage area (20) by two repeaters (18' and 18"), in 10A and 10B a coverage area (20) for

10

each repeater (18) in a star and daisy configuration, respectively, and in Fig. 11 two coverage areas (20) for two repeaters (18). However, Cook's teaching of separate, multiple, or duplicate coverage areas associated with corresponding repeaters in the mentioned figures is not the same as the claimed limitation: "at least one of the slave-CPUs being adapted to vary a size of a coverage area provided by an associated slave transceiver."

5.   The applicant amended claim 4 to delete the redundant word "to."

6.   The applicant has not added any new matter in any of the amended or new claims.

7.   In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

8.   If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of the response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 25, 2005   By: _____
QUALCOMM Incorporated   Donald C. Kordich
5775 Morehouse Drive   Attorney for Applicant
San Diego, California 92121-2779   Registration No. 38,213
Telephone: (858) 658-5928
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

11